पर इस प्रकार का एक खुला मंच आयोजित किया जाए जिसमें स्थानीय सांसद के सहयोग से इन समस्याओं का निराकरण किया जाए।

केरोसीन की मिलावट की शिकायत बहुत मिल रही है और यह शिकायत रहती है कि केरोसीन जिस मूल्य पर दिया जाता है, उस मूल्य पर वह मिलता नहीं है। हमने आने के बाद यह भी तय किया है कि देश के अंदर हर विकास खंड केन्द्र पर एक पैरलल मार्केटिंग में केरोसीन ऑयल बेचा जाए जिससे कि उसकी मिलावट भी न हो और आम आदमी को केरोसीन मिल सके। इसमें भी अगर माननीय सदस्य किसी शिकायत की ओर इंगित करते हैं तो उसके ऊपर निश्चित रूप से कार्यवाही की जाएगी।

SHRI PARAG CHALIHA: Sir, the peculiar situation in the North-East, particularly in Assam, is known to everybody. I do not want to dilate on that. The statement shows the percentage in different categories. Unfortunately, it does not include unemployed and retired persons of that particular area. Will the hon. Minister be pleased to include these two categories also, in view of the fact that non-inclusion of unemployed and other categories, frustrates the youth and allures them towards extremism. So, will the hon. Minister kindly see whether it could be done?

श्री संतोष कुमार गंगवार: सर, हमने इसकी एक नीति बनाई हुई है, पर इसके बाद भी जिस समस्या के ऊपर ध्यान आकर्षित किया गया है। हम इस ओर ध्यान देंगे और इसके ऊपर विचार करके माननीय सदस्य को अवगत करायेंगे।

MR. CHAIRMAN: Sixteen minutes are over. Now, let us go to the next Question.

*222. *[The questioners (Prof. Vijay Kumar Malhotra and Shri Raghavji were absent. For answer, vide col-32 infra.]*

Central assistance to States

*223. SHRI ABANI ROY:†
SHRI GHUFRAN AZAM:

Will the Minister of PLANNING AND PROGRAMME IMPLEMENTATION be pleased to state:

(a) whether some State Governments have sought changes in the Gadgil-Mukherjee formula in providing Central Assistance to States;

(b) if so, the reaction of the Indian Government thereon;

(c) the details of representations sent by the State Government to Union Government in this regard; and

(d) since when the Gadgil-Mukherjee formula is applicable and by when changes would be made in the formula?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF RAILWAYS, MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS AND MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF PLANNING AND PROGRAMME IMPLEMENTATION (SHRI RAM NAIK): (a) Yes, Sir. The views of State Governments on this subject were sought. Comments have not been received from all States.

(b) The Government would formulate the considered opinion after receipt of comments from all States and their consideration.

(c) The details of representations received would be furnished after receipt of representations from all States;

(d) The Gadgil-Mukherjee formula was approved by the NDC in December 1991. Changes in this formula would be based on the decisions of the NDC as and when taken.

SHRI ABANI ROY: My first supplementary is this. Whether the demand for special assistance to the States bogged down in terrorism and subversive activities has been fulfilled or not. If it is 'Yes', the details thereof.

† The Question was actually asked on the floor of the House by Shri Abani Roy.

SHRI RAM NAIK: I would request the hon. Member to repeat his supplementary again. It is not audible.

SHRI ABANI ROY: Sir, whether the demand for special assistance to the States bogged down in terrorism and subversive activities has been fulfilled or not. If yes, the details thereof.

SHRI RAM NAIK: Sir, it is a general question about the allocation on the basis of the Gadgil-Mukherjee formula for central assistance. Now, on the basis of different requests, the formula has been revised on three occasions; and the views—about their points of view and their comments on what counts the classification should be changed of all the States were sought. We are consolidating the suggestions received from all the States. But, some States have not sent their suggestions so far. So, that process is yet to be completed.

SHRI ABANI ROY: Whether the modalities for transferring 170 Centrally-sponsored Schemes to States, as demanded by the Chief Ministers of those States, have been worked out. If it is "yes" the details thereon.

SHRI RAM NAIK: Recently, on 19th February, the meeting of the National Development Council took place. This subject was kept before the Council for its consideration. The Chief Ministers of different States expressed their opinion. Since no specific consensus could be arrived at, it has been decided in the meeting to form a Sub-Committee, under the Chairmanship of the Deputy Chairman of the Planning Commission with some Central Ministers and some State Ministers as Members to arrive at the criterion. This has been decided in the meeting of the N.D.C. held on 19th February.

श्री गुफ़रान आज़म: सर, 20 फरवरी को प्लानिंग कमीशन के वाइस चेयरमैन साहब ने अनाउंस किया था कि गाडेगील कमीशन को कंसीडर नहीं किया जाएगा। मैं माननीय मंत्री जी से यह पूछना चाहता हूं कि कोई भी आपातकालीन स्थिति जब स्टेट्स में होती है या जैसे सेन्टर ने अभी डी०ए० बढ़ा दिया, इस कंडीशन में स्टेट्स को ज्यादा सहायता की जरूरत पड़ती है, तो क्या आप इसको दुबारा से रि-कंसीडर करेंगे कि स्टेट्स को उनकी नीड्स के लिए उसको प्लानिंग कमीशन से रिव्यु कराया जाए?

श्री राम नाईक: सभापति जी, डिप्टी चेयरमैन ने ऐसा कुछ नहीं कहा है।

श्री गुफ़रान आज़म: पेपर में आया है।

श्री राम नाईक: अखबार में आया है, लेकिन मैं आपको उस मीटिंग के मिनिट्स एक्जेक्टली पढ़कर बताता हूं। किसी अखबार वाले ने लिखते समय कुछ कम ज्यादा किया होगा तो बात दूसरी है।

This is the resolution: "The N.D.C. has decided to set up a Sub-Committee under the Chairmanship of the Deputy Chairman, Planning Commission, with members drawn from the Central Ministers and State Ministers to go into the criterion for allocation of funds under major rural poverty alleviation schemes, etc." ये जो सैन्ट्ली सपोन्सर्ड स्कीम्स हैं उनके बारे में the meeting noted that there is a wide divergence of opinion among the States; and between the Central Ministries and the States, on the transfer of Centrally-sponsored schemes, and the modality of the transfer of schemes. After discussions, the NDC decided to constitute a sub-committee of the NDC, under the chairmanship of the Deputy Chairman, Planning Commission, with a few Union Ministers and some State Chief Ministers as its members. So, this was the decision. Probably, the reporting of the media might not be correct.

SHRI SOLIPETA RAMAHCANDRA REDDY: Mr. Chairman, Sir, many State Governments have sent their views on the subject. I believe, they appeared in the local Press also. So, they are no more confidential. Will the hon. Minister place the details of the representations, already received by the Ministry, on the Table of the House?

SHRI RAM NAIK: Sir, I must first make it clear that all the States have not sent their comments. Out of 27 States, 23 States have given the information so far.

Four of them have not yet sent their comments. We have reminded them to give the information, as early as possible. On the basis of the information received from 23 States, we have prepared a table. We have tabulated the whole information. It is a big table. If the House directs me, I am ready to place it on the Table of House. There is no harm in it.

DR. ARUN KUMAR SARMA: Mr. Chairman, Sir, in order to implement the recommendations of the Fifth Pay Commission, many of the State Governments have requested the Central Government to give additional assistance to them, so that they can cope with the additional financial requirements. Many States had to implement these recommendations, by diverting the funds from the Plan assistance. I would like to know from the hon. Minister whether the Central Government had assisted the State Governments when the recommendations of the earlier 2-3 Pay Commissions were implemented.

SHRI RAM NAIK: Sir, I believe, the question asked by the hon. Member is not within the scope of the main question

SHRI CHAIRMAN: So, you need not reply.

SHRI J. CHITHARANJAN: Sir, the hon. Minister has stated that 23 States have already submitted their opinion, and only four States are left, which have yet to submit their opinion. So, after giving a reasonable time, by which time would the Government be able to finally formulate their proposals with regard to this?

SHRI RAM NAIK: Sir, we will formulate our proposals as soon as we receive them. However, we have written a letter to them that if they do not send their comments at the earliest, it would be considered that they have no comments to offer. After that letter also, about one month's more time has been given to them. After that we will try to classify the information. Then, the matter will have to be first considered by the Planning Commission; after that, by the Cabinet, and, finally, the matter goes for a decision to the National Development Council. We will try to do this as early as possible.

SHRI S. VIDUTHALAI VIRUMBI: Sir, even though the percentage of taxes what they are giving to the States has increased, when it is compared with the GDP, we find that it has come down in the last five years, and also the Central Government is resorting to the method of imposing some surcharge through customs and excise, and things like that. Basic duties mean, the State Governments will get their share. But if they levy surcharge on basic duties, then the States will not get their share. Therefore, I want to know from the hon'ble Minister whether they would give their share from the surcharge which they are levying, to the States.

SHRI RAM NAIK: Sir, the question pertains to the Finance Commission. I am concerned with the Planning Commission. In what way we should distribute the taxes collected, is within the domain of the Finance Commission and also the Finance Ministry.

श्री सभापति: श्री बालकवि बैरागी।

श्री बालकवि बैरागी: माननीय सभापति महोदय, मैं माननीय मंत्री जी से जानना चाहता हूं कि आपने अभी अपने उत्तर में बयाता कि चार राज्यों ने आपको ब्यौरा नहीं दिया है। मेरे सवाल का पहला भाग यह है कि वे चार राज्य कौन-कौन से हैं? कृपया उनका नाम बताइये। मेरा दूसरा प्रश्न, चार राज्यों आन्ध्र प्रदेश, राजस्थान, महाराष्ट्र और मध्य प्रदेश को लेकर है कि इन चार राज्यों को गत दो वर्षों में आपने जो सहायता दी, जो राशि दी। आवंटित की, तो जो उनको पैसा मिला उसमें मध्य प्रदेश के साथ जो पक्षपात हुआ है, उसके साथ जो अन्याय हुआ है, इस तीन स्टेट्स के मुकाबले में, उसके क्या कारण हैं? हमारा पैसा क्यों रोक लिया गया है? यह मैं आपसे जानना चाहता हूं।

श्री राम नाईक: सभापति जी, जिन चार राज्यों ने अपने कमेंट भेजे हैं, उसमें दो स्पेशल कैटेगरी स्टेट हैं। कुल मिलाकर ऐसे दस स्पेशल कैटेगरी स्टेट हैं। इनमें से आठ ने अपने कमेंट भेजे हैं, दो ने नहीं भेजे हैं। इनमें

से एक है अरुणाचल और दूसरा राज्य है नागालैण्ड। Out of the non-special category States, one is Orissa and the second State is Gujarat. With regard to the distribution, there is a set formula which was evolved in 1991. So, whatever has been given to a State, is based on that formula. The funds have been allocated on the basis of that formula. Now, there is a specific point that comes out of the question, and I must respond to it. He has mentioned about Maharashtra and Madhya Pradesh, and that is the point on which the N.D.C. will have to finally decide, as the progressive States feel that they should not be penalised because they are progressive. On the basis of efficiency, their allocations must be increased. Those States which are backward feel that social considerations should be taken into consideration. Now, this is the position, so far as Madhya Pradesh is concerned. On the basis of the criterion that has been decided at present, Madhya Pradesh has been accordingly allocated the funds. It is not that it has not been given the funds that are due to it.

SHRI S.R. BOMMAI: Sir, after the acceptance of the Gadgil formula, the State Governments have been representing to the Central Government, the Finance Commission and the Planning Commission, to change the formula. Many things have changed. The circumstances have changed. Therefore, the method of Centre-State sharing of the revenues must also be changed. I would like to know from the hon'ble Minister the time-frame within which the Government will take a final decision because this matter is being debated and debated and no decision has been taken by any Government. I must say, this has been the attitude of the Centre towards the States.

SHRI RAM NAIK: Sir, this formula was revised earlier in 1991. After that, as the hon'ble Member has said, many Governments have come and many Governments have gone. Now, we are collecting the information and, as I reacted to the earlier question, we will give them some time; about a month or so. Then we will consolidate the information, and after the Cabinet takes a decision, we will have to go to the N.D.C. this process does take some time and it will be our endeavour to do it as early as possible.

SHRI. S. B. CHAVAN: Mr. Chairman, Sir, there are two or three issues about which I would like to have information from the hon. Minister. The feeling that we get is that one of the reasons why the deficit is increasing is due to the fact that the Planning Commission, while scrutinising the Annual Plans of different State Governments, does not properly scrutinise the capacity of the State Governments to raise the resources. In order to show that you are boosting their Plans, irrespective of the fact whether they have the capacity or not, you just accept what the State Governments say. This is one of the reasons why the State Governments' deficits are increasing, and the entire burden definitely comes on the Central Government also. This is one information I want to have, whether proper scrutiny of the Annual Plans submitted by the State Governments is being undertaken by the Planning Commission.

The second thing on which I want to have information from the hon. Minister is about some areas where it is necessary for the Planning Commission to take a view. Say, there are some projects which are externally aided. Do you take proper care to see that the counterpart fund to be provided for by the State Governments has been provided for? At least my experience in this field has been that whatever the State Government says, you accept it. There is a huge amount of foreign assistance available, which is not being utilised, as the corresponding State Government's share is not provided for in their annual Plans.

Sir, the third thing on which I wa.it to have information is about this. The Finance Minister was pleased to state in his statement that there are some irrigation projects which are going to be given a priority. I want to understand whether these will be part of the Central assistance or these will be outside the Central assistance.

I would like to have information only on these three points.

SHRI RAM NAIK: Sir, the hon. Member has been Finance Minister and also Deputy Chairman of the Planning Commission. He wants information only on three points.

So far as a proper scrutiny is concerned, I do not know what was happening earlier. When our Government took over, the Plan for the last year, 1998-99, was a sort of *fait accompli* because the Budgets of the States were by that time passed. This year we have been doing this exercise. After that there will be scrutiny. We are allocating according to the formula. I must say that in the case of States whose Plans have been finalised, their Chief Ministers have expressed their satisfacting that justice has been done to them.

So far as externally aided projects are concerned, certainly this component is taken into consideration while deciding about the Central assistance. If the States are in a position to raise the allocation, then only the relevant amounts are sanctioned to them.

The third question is about irrigation projects. Allocations are being given to those irrigation projects which can be completed early. But they do not come in the Plan as such. A separate scheme is there for accelerated irrigation projects, which is handled by the Water Resurces Ministry.

SHRI S. B. CHAVAN: Is it outside the Annual Plan?

SHRI RAM NAIK: If you don't mind, the Minister of State can clarify that issue because he is handling it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It will take a long time. No clarification is needed.

Resolution Adopted in G-15 Summit

*224. SHRI NILOTPAL BASU: †
SHRI DIPANKAR MUKHERJEE:

Will the MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that G-15 Summit was held recently;

(b) if so, the salient features of the resolution adopted and details thereof;

(c) whether it is also a fact that the final resolution was watered down due to the soft stand of the Indian and Egyptian position despite strong positioon of Malaysia and Jamaica against some adverse global economic development for the developing countries by the Superpower; and

(d) if so, the details thereof and if not, how do Government justify the benign conclusions?

THE MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI JASWANT SINGH): (a) Yes, Sir. The Ninth G-15 Summit was held at Montego Bay, Jamaica, from 10—12 February, 1999.

(b) to (d) The final Resolution, as The Joint Communique, issued by the Ninth Summit, the result of extensive discussions in a spirit of solidarity, on various global issues of critical concern to developing countries, was, as per prevalent convention drafted by the then Chair-Jamaica.

Its salient features include, a call by G-15 countries to establish an international consultative process for reform of

† The question was actually asked on the floor of the House by Shri Nilotpal Basu.